



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:	Hyung Ju Lee)	Confirmation No.	8761
)		
Serial No.:	10/774,893)	Art Unit:	2818
)		
Filed:	February 9, 2004)	Examiner:	Luu, Chuong A.
)		
For:	Leadframe for Semiconductor)		
	Package)		

RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

OK, To Be ENTERED
CM

Dear Sir/Madam:

Applicant hereby responds to the Final Office Action mailed June 6, 2006 in relation to the above-identified patent application. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 22-42 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over Claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,713,322. In this regard, though the arguments presented in Applicant's prior Office Action Response filed March 16, 2006 were successful in overcoming the anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on the Karnezos et al. reference as presented in the prior Office Action of December 14, 2005, Applicant inadvertently failed to address the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 22-42 presented in such Office Action.

In response to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 22-42 now presented in the subject Office Action, submitted herewith for the Examiner's consideration is a duly executed Terminal Disclaimer wherein Applicant has agreed to disclaim that term of any patent issuing in relation to the present application which extends beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent No. 6,713,322. Based on the recent telephone conference between Applicant's representative and the Examiner, it is Applicant's understanding that the